



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,993	12/06/2004	Sami Uskela	089229.00042	1328
32294	7590	11/02/2007		
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 14TH FLOOR 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			EXAMINER NGUYEN, SIMON	
			ART UNIT 2618	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/02/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/516,993

Applicant(s)

USKELA, SAMI

Examiner

SIMON D. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Puuskari (6,728,208).

Regarding claims 15-16, Puuskari discloses a packet data transmission system (figs.1-2, abstract), comprising: a plurality of transmission units ( a MS unit and a GGSN unit), wherein the units transmit a packet context to each other (abstract, column 1 lines 36-42, column 7 lines 5-10, column 17 lines 41-55, column 18 lines 40-55), wherein the plurality of transmission units use a single packet data context to communicate (column 17 lines 1, 6, column 17 lines 41-55, column 18 lines 40-55), and wherein each of the plurality of transmission unit has a unique IP address (column 10 lines 4, 7).

3. Claims 1-2, 6-8, 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Maclean (2002/0101859).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Maclean discloses a packet data transmission method (figs.1,4a-b, abstract), comprising: employing a packet protocol for data transmission (paragraphs 23-24); identifying participant with IP addresses (paragraphs

Art Unit: 2618

24, 39, 42-43); activating a packet data context (step 219 of fig.4a, paragraph 48); and transmitting data at a scheduled time (column 1 lines 63-65, column 4 lines 20-51); a packet context contains a source IP address and a destination IP address (paragraph 39, 42) which reads on “ associating one packet data context with more than one IP addresses”; transmitting the data to the participants (a source unit and a destination unit) (abstract, paragraph 37).

Regarding claims 2, Maclean further discloses the MS activating the packet data (paragraph 48, step 219 of fig.4a).

Regarding claims 6, 13, Maclean further discloses activating the packet data context between the MS and GGSN (figs. 1, 4a-4b).

Regarding claim 7, Maclean further discloses transferring data between the MS and GGSN relating to more than one IP address using one packet data context (paragraphs 39-44, figs.2-3, 4a-b).

Regarding claims 8, 14, Maclean further discloses the quality of service is in use (paragraph 38).

Regarding claim 12, Maclean further discloses the terminal is a mobile station and involving in the packet transmission to other equipments (RAN, SGSN, GGSN), wherein the packet embedded with the MS and the equipments' addresses (figs. 2-3, 4a-b, paragraphs 38-44).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maclean (2002/0101859) in view of Puuskari (6,728,208).

Regarding claims 3, Maclean further discloses identifying one or more units of terminal equipments with IP addresses (paragraphs 39, 42-43, figs. 2-3). However, Maclean fails to teach the IP address is unique addresses.

Puuskari discloses a mobile unit and a GGSN having unique IP addresses (column 10 lines 2-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Maclean, modified by Puuskari in order to prevent the transmission of packet data to a wrong person.

6. Claims 4-5, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maclean (2002/0101859) in view of Puuskari (6,728,208), and further in view of Sidhushayana et al. (US 2004/0160984 A1).

Regarding claims 4-5, 17-18, Maclean fails to teach sending packet data to more than one IP address.

Sidhushayana discloses a packet transmission, in which a single packet embedded with a multiple of destination addresses, which will send to multiple users

Art Unit: 2618

(abstract, paragraph 33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Maclean, modified by Sidhushayana in order to shorten the time to set up a PDP context to each participant.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maclean (2002/0101859) in view of Puuskari, and further in view of Ibanez et al. (2003/0026230).

Regarding claim 9, the modified Maclean fails to teach or suggest the MS sending a request for a new IP address.

Ibanez teaches or suggests the MS sending a request for a new IP address (paragraphs 35, 43-44, 49, 54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have Maclean, modified by Ibanez in order to participate in the packet data transmission.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maclean (2002/0101859) in view of Puuskari, and further in view of Kumaki et al. (2002/0191562).

Regarding claim 10, the modified Maclean fails to teach or suggest the MS sending a request for releasing the IP address.

Kumaki discloses a MS sending a request for releasing an IP address (paragraphs 186,552). Therefore, it would have been obviously to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Maclean, modified by Kumaki in

Art Unit: 2618

order to save cost of the service when the mobile station does not involve in a packet transmission.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner can use the art of Sidhushayana to reject the limitation of claims 1, 11 "associating one packet data context with more than one internet protocol address" (see Sidhushayana, paragraph 33). However, the claim language of claims 1, 11 still can be read on with Maclean as the responsive to Remarks filed 5/9/07, for the following reasons: in paragraphs 39 and 42, Maclean discloses that "a PDP context is carried in an IP packet ..... the IP packet has a source address 102A and a destination address 102B (paragraph 39) or "the packet carrying the PDP context contains a source address and a destination address" (paragraph 42). The disclosures of Maclean can be expressed as "associating one packet data context with more than one internet protocol address".

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:00PM.

Art Unit: 2618

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (571) 272-7899.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

600 Dulany, Alexandria, VA 22314

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Simon Nguyen

October 24, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Simon Nguyen', with a stylized, flowing script.

**SIMON NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**